

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. **FILING DATE** FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/783,931 02/15/2001 7326-122 David Ish-Horowicz 8177 **EXAMINER** 20583 04/12/2005 7590 **JONES DAY** KAUFMAN, CLAIRE M **222 EAST 41ST ST ART UNIT** PAPER NUMBER NEW YORK, NY 10017 1646

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/783,931	ISH-HOROWICZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Claire M. Kaufman	1646
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>pending</u>		
(1) <u>Claire M. Kaufman</u> .	(3)	
(2) William Thomann.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 4 April 2005	Time: <u>10:00</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	pplicant's representative)	
Part I.		•
Rejection(s) discussed: 35 USC 112, first paragraph		
Claims discussed: 146-151		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G	SENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	3 DISCUSSED:
Part III.		-
 □ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. □ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
		•
Claui M. Kos		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	olicant/Applicant's Representative S	ignature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Mr. Thomann alerted the Examiner to a typographical error in the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, on pages 4 and 5 of the Office action of 11/30/04. SEQ ID NO:24 should have been SEQ ID NO:26, which is a human sequence, while SEQ ID NO:24 is a mouse/human consensus sequence.

Mr. Thomann also alerted the Examiner that claims 146-151 were not accounted for in the previous Office action. Claims 146-151, in addition to previously indicated claims 99-100, 105, 106, 108, 1 10-1 12, 126-128 and 138-141, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.